

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated June 10, 2005. After entry of this amendment, claims 1-40 and 47-69 will continue to be pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested in view of the remarks made below.

1. The Allowable Claims

Claims 6, 8, 14-17, 21, 22, 32-35, 39, 40, 52 and 54 were objected to in the Office Action as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicant has presented new independent claims 61-69. Claim 61 is original claim 6 in independent form. Claim 62 is original dependent claim 8 in independent form. Claim 63 is original dependent claim 14 rewritten in independent form. Independent claims 65, 66, 67, 68 and 69 are respectively original dependent claims 32, 35, 39, 52 and 54 rewritten in independent form. All of these claim should be allowable and an indication of such in the next official communication is respectfully solicited.

2. The Prior Art Rejections

The original independent claims 1, 23 and 47 along with several of the dependent claims were rejected under Section 102(b) based alternatively under either U.S. Patent 6,155,270 to Samiean ("Samiean"), U. S. Patent 5,897,262 to Bratby-Carey (Bratby-Carey") or U. S. Patent 5,762,077 to Griffiths, Jr. ("Griffiths"). None of these references appears to be particularly relevant to Applicants invention because none of the references discloses a container for storing styptic material or structure for applying styptic material to an animal. The point of the rejections appears to have been that any container may be used to store styptic and therefore would be anticipatory of Applicants claims. While Applicant does not necessarily agree with this, all three of the independent claims have been amended to positively recite styptic material as part of the claimed combination, which should positively define the claims over the prior art of record. All of the claims now pending should therefore be allowable.

3. *The Double Patenting Rejection*

Claims 47 and 51 were rejected based on obviousness-type double patenting in view of Applicant's U.S. Patent 6,827,038. This rejection should be obviated by the attached Terminal Disclaimer.

4. *Conclusion*

Applicant has made an earnest effort to place this application in condition for allowance. If the Examiner feels that a telephone interview would expedite prosecution of this patent application, she is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigned at 215-599-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

John L. Knoble
Registration No. 32,387

Date: December 12, 2005

KNOBLE YOSHIDA & DUNLEAVY, LLC
Eight Penn Center- Suite 1350
1628 John F. Kennedy Boulevard
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 599-0600